



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/047,446	01/14/2002	Max Copperman	1546.015US1	1061
------------	------------	---------------	-------------	------

21186 7590 05/31/2007
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/047,446	Applicant(s) COPPERMAN ET AL.	
Examiner Neveen Abel-Jalil	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-11,25-31,36-42 and 62-64 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 25-31,36-42, and 62-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7-May -2007 has been entered.
2. The amendment filed on 7-May -2007 has been received and entered. Claims 1, 3-11, 25-31, 36-42 and 62-64 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 10, recite "extracting at least one concept feature that appears in at least one document in the set of one or more documents". Are those the same documents that were retrieved by user's query? If so, the limitation should clearly state that the "document" are based on results of the "user's query". Or is the extracting occurring prior to "user's query as in trained set of "extracted features" stored in the database?

Art Unit: 2165

While, while the next limitation recite “using the at least one concept feature to determined at least one matched concept” without any further indication as to how said “matched concept” came to be, where did it come from? What is being matched? How is this matching taking place? Is it a match between the query and the document concepts? The claim is not clear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3-11, 25-31, 36-42 and 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Copperman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,585 B1).

As to claim 1, Copperman et al. discloses a method of steering an end-user to a document needed by the end-user, the method including:

receiving from the end-user a user query including language (See column 2, lines 50-53);

using at least a portion of the user query to search for an retrieve a set of one or more documents needed by the end user (See column 2, lines 50-55);

extracting at least one concept feature that appears in at least one document in the set of one or more documents (See column 2, lines 21-24);

Art Unit: 2165

using the at least one concept feature to determine at least one matched concept that corresponds to the at least one concept feature (See column 2, lines 55-59, and see column 20, lines 15-27); and

presenting to the end-user at least one indication of the at least one matched concept and at least one document associated with the at least one matched concept (See Figure 22, also see column 7, lines 36-38).

As to claim 3, Copperman et al. discloses further including:

presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept (See column 7, lines 31-38);

receiving from the user a selection of at least one related concept (See column 7, lines 39-47, and see column 40, lines 1-9); and

presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one document associated with the user-selected related concept (See column 7, lines 49-67).

As to claims 4, 26, and 27, Copperman et al. discloses in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of at least one document associated with the user-selected related concept includes presenting to the user the at least one indication of the at least one document associated with both the user-selected related concept and the at least one matched concept (See column 10, lines 27-35, and see column 30, lines 51-65).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 5, Copperman et al. discloses further including presenting to the user at least one indication of the at least one matched concept (See corresponding rejection in claim 1 above).

As to claim 6, Copperman et al. discloses in which the presenting to the user at least one indication of the at least one matched concept and the presenting to the user at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the user a paired indication of:

(1) a matched concept, and (2) a corresponding related concept (See column 40, lines 5-9).

As to claims 7, and 28, Copperman et al. discloses further including ranking related concepts (See column 27, lines 14-27).

As to claims 8, and 62, Copperman et al. discloses in which the presenting to the end-user at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept includes presenting to the end-user ranked indications of related concepts (See column 7, lines 36-38, and see column 27, lines 14-27, and see column 31, lines 44-47).

As to claims 9, 29, and 63, Copperman et al. discloses in which the ranking related concepts includes ranking using a number of times that the related concept was previously-selected by at least one end-user (See column 32, lines 6-10).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claims 10, 30, and 64, Copperman et al. discloses further including promoting a related concept in the ranking when a previous selection by an end-user resulted in an inferred success in returning at least one relevant document (See column 16, lines 1-13, and see column 40, lines 34-41, and column 40, lines 54-59).

As to claim 11, Copperman et al. discloses a computer-readable medium for performing the method of claim 1 (See claim 1 rejection above).

As to claim 25, Copperman et al. discloses a method of steering an end-user to a document needed by the end-user, the method including:

receiving from the end-user a user query including language (See corresponding rejection in claim 1 above);

searching for and retrieving a set of one or more documents by determining whether at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches at least concept feature associated with at least one concept in a plurality of concepts in a knowledge map that are pregrouped into a plurality of groups, each concept including as evidence at least one concept feature (See column 36, lines 55-65);

extracting at least one concept feature that appears in at least one document in the set of one or more documents (See corresponding rejection in claim 1 above);

using the at least one concept feature to determine at least one matched concept that corresponds to the at least one concept feature (See corresponding rejection in claim 1 above);

presenting to the end-user, when the at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches the at least one concept feature associated with a concept, wherein the at least one concept feature is obtained from the set of one or more documents, at least one indication of the at least one matched concept and at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept, the at least one related concept determined from a predefined correspondence relationship between the at least one matched concept and the at least one related concept, the indication of the at least one related concept presented as corresponding to the at least one matched concept to which it is related (See column 2, lines 15-34, and see column 15, lines 32-40, and column 15, lines 33-36, and see column 34, lines 45-55); and

presenting to the end-user, when the at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches the at least one concept feature associated with the at least one concept, at least one indication of the at least one matched concept and at least one document associated with the at least one matched concept, the at least one document drawn from a plurality of documents that are respectively linked to one or more of the concepts in the knowledge map (See Figure 22, also see column 16, lines 33-42, and see column 24, lines 13-24).

As to claim 31, Copperman et al. discloses a computer-readable medium for performing the method of claim 25 (See claim 25 rejection).

As to claim 36, Copperman et al. discloses a method of steering a user to a document needed by the end-user, the method including:

Art Unit: 2165

receiving from the end-user a user query including language (See corresponding rejection in claim 1 above);

searching and retrieving a set of one or more documents determining whether at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches at least one concept feature associated with a concept in a plurality of concepts in a knowledge map that are pre-grouped into a plurality of primary groups, each concept including as evidence at least one concept feature that is also in at least one document in a plurality of documents that are tagged to one or more of the concepts in the knowledge map, wherein the at least one concept feature is extracted from the set of one or more documents (See corresponding rejection in claim 25 above);

presenting to the end-user, when the at least one feature in the user query language substantially matches the at least one concept feature associated with the concept (See column 30, lines 10-32):

at least one indication of the at least one matched concept (See corresponding rejection in claim 2 above);

at least one indication of at least one related concept to the at least one matched concept (See corresponding rejection in claim 2 above); and

at least one indication of at least one document associated with the at least one matched concept (See corresponding rejection in claim 2 above).

As to claim 37, Copperman et al. discloses in which the related concept is obtained from a derived group mapping relationships between primary group concept nodes from the same or different primary groups (See column 14, lines 62-67, and see column 15, lines 50-67).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 38, Copperman et al. teaches in which the primary groups or derived groups including an Activities group, a Symptoms group, a Products group, and an Objects group.

Specific to the claim language of:

further including obtaining a related concept to the at least one matched concept from a derived group that includes **at least one of:**

an Activities and Objects group, including at least one relationship between an Activities concept and an Objects concept;

an Activities and Products group, including at least one relationship between an Activities concept and a Products concept (See column 6, table 1-continued, under the heading “Usage”, which describes Product family and relationships);

a Symptoms and Objects group, including at least one relationship between a Symptoms concept and an Objects concept;

a Symptoms and Products group, including at least one relationship between a Symptoms concept and a Products concept; and

a Symptoms and Activities group, including at least one relationship between a Symptoms concept and an Activities concept.

As to claim 39, is rejected under the same rationale as claim 38 wherein Copperman et al. to teach:

further including obtaining a related concept to the at least one matched concept from a derived group that includes **at least one of:**

Art Unit: 2165

an Activities and Activities group, including at least one relationship between different Activities concepts;

an Objects and Objects group, including at least one relationship between different Objects concepts;

a Symptoms and Symptoms group, including at least one relationship between different Symptoms concepts; and

a Products and Products group, including at least one relationship between different Products concepts (See column 6, lines 25-30, and see column 9, lines 41-46).

As to claim 40, Copperman et al. discloses further including obtaining a related concept to the at least one matched concept from a derived group that includes **at least one of**:

at least one lexically-similar group, including at least one relationship between lexically similar concepts (See column 10, lines 1-9); and

at least one semantically-similar group, including at least one relationship between semantically similar concepts (See column 10, lines 60-67).

As to claim 41, is rejected under the same rationale as claim 38 wherein Copperman et al. teach:

in which the primary groups consist only of Products, Activities, Symptoms (See column 6, table 1-continued, also see column 10, lines 25-35, wherein “Symptoms” reads on “Issues”), and Objects groups (See column 34, lines 41-52).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 42, Copperman et al. discloses a computer-readable medium for performing the method of claim 36 (See claim 36 rejection above).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-11, 25-31, 36-42 and 62-64 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-Form 892 for list of cited references.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2165

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Neveen Abel-Jalil
May 27, 2007